



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CRAYON.

VOL. IV.

J U L Y.

PART VII.

J. DURAND, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

PUBLICATION OFFICE, 373 BROADWAY.

THE TORSO.

“— quando omnibus omnia large,
Tellus ipsa part naturaque daedala rerum.”

Lucretius.

(Translated for THE CRAYON from the German of Adolf Stahr.)

[Copyright secured according to Act of Congress.]

CHAPTER I.—(Continued.)

II.

THE GREEKS AND THEIR DIVINITIES.

THE Greeks are the first people which a historian of humanity would feel warranted in characterizing as an *ethical* people, competent to govern its passions, and competent to be free. Only in such a purer national atmosphere could the Oriental religious idea, consisting as it did of vague instincts and rapid sentiments, be disciplined into a religion, founded upon a definitive moral system, and upon solid principles. The divinities of Greece all originated in Asia. The gods of the Orientalists were at first purely local divinities; it was only gradually that they became catholic. But under the hallowed influence of Grecian poesy, and fired by the sparks of Grecian genius, we find these Oriental divinities assume the majestic appearance of Olympic gods, possessing a moral and national character. “*Man moulds his god after his own “image.”*” The Greeks were the first nation to establish the moral responsibility of every individual. Upon the same principle they connected with all of their special divinities, a special moral attribute: they are no longer merely allegorical gods, but divine beings, instinct with all the faculties, agitated by all the passions, palpitating with all the emotions, and stimulated by all the ambitions that fall to the common lot of humanity. They are gods taken, indeed, from Nature, but Nature refined and spiritualized by Grecian genius. The moral attribute of the god is even stamped upon his physical appearance. The spiritual aspirations which connect him with spheres celestial are never merged in the flesh and blood realities which invest him with the material conditions of humanity. Art strives to refine material form in such a manner as to bring it into the greatest attainable harmony with the spiritual character of the divinity. To render form and expression suggestive, as well as typical of the spirit of the idea, this is the aim of Art. Take, for instance, the divinity of agriculture: how suggestive of fertility and plenty; the luscious luxuriance of the form, how suggestive of comfort and happiness, how animating the buoyancy and joyousness of the expression! Or, take the divinities of light,

Artemis or Phœbus, and Apollo: their form is quite ethereal and luminous, and their expression as steadily and brightly settled in its composure as light itself in the consciousness of its daily mission.

The Oriental gods are mere symbols of natural powers; but the gods of Greece are the powers themselves. Poseidon is not a mere symbol of the ocean, but the ocean itself. The ocean is a spirit, and the name of the spirit is Poseidon. And Poseidon's character is as restless, wild, and unruly as that of the ocean. Plutarch declared many centuries ago that, “The gods of Homer are the natural “representatives of the various forces of the universe.” Every wonderful creative, as well as every awful destructive element in Nature, impressed the ancients as divine. The Greeks classified these elements, and introduced something like order in the confusion of creation. The strange, the creative, the terrible, the destructive, every one of these elements was carefully separated from the others, and received its assigned special place in the scale of the moral universe. But this was not all. The Greek was not merely content with putting an end to the confusion of Orientalism, but after having taken up one idea after the other, and, as it were, labelled it with a specific name, he did not lay it down again, trusting to chance and to future generations to put all right. No; he took every idea to his heart, put his soul into it, put the fire of his genius into it, put the soaring enthusiasm of his imagination into it—and lo! the element, the idea became a god; the mystic chaos of the Oriental shadows of divinity became so many distinct, living, glorious Grecian gods. In this spiritual laboratory of the Greek every phase of the life of the nation was marked with an impress of divine stamp. Take, for instance, the health-invigorating gymnastic exercises of the people. Is the morale of such national habits not beautifully expressed in the elegant and elastic, delicate and vigorous appearance of Hermes, which adorns the Palaestra of the Greek?

Nor is there any one-sidedness to be found among the Grecian divinities. They are not gods who can only grasp *one* idea, and whose balance of power would be disturbed if they were to sympathize with an other. They can cherish many different ideas—nay, represent all the ideas of the universe—without losing their own special individuality. Like the sun, that shines upon all, ever preserving in the midst of his luminous universality his sunny individuality, the Grecian gods put themselves in affinity with every emotion of humanity without losing the sun of their spe-

cial divine entity. Apollo, for instance, the god of song and of music, is at the same time the god of knowledge, and of prophecy, and the divinity who detects and punishes crimes. Zeus, the god of hospitality, is at the same time the divinity of vows and of compacts. The Hellenic divinities are not abstractions, but living beings; they stand upon the basis of the laws of Nature, and are subject to the laws of humanity. They go, as it were, through the various stages of existence; they are conscious and sentient beings; they participate in the joys and in the afflictions of creation; not only in evils inflicted by the hand of other divinities, but also in evils inflicted by the hand of man.

"To become a man after the image of God"—this was the goal of Grecian ambition. Hence the Greeks entertained an ineffable contempt for the animal types and symbolism which fettered the spirit of Orientals with wonder, awe, and admiration. The old animal monsters which represented gods were, to adopt the language of the Grecian poets, overcome and vanquished by a new generation of divinities—divinities who blended the spiritual elements of divine nature with the moral elements of humanity. It is the Grecian's innate love for the Beautiful which has achieved this remarkable victory. Thenceforward symbols are only employed to illustrate *things*, they are never employed to illustrate *gods*: here and there we find symbols in the shape of animals and weapons, associated with the god, or which the god carries in his hand, as, for instance, the eagle of Zeus, the panther of Dionysus, the dolphin of Aphrodite, the thunderbolts of Jove, the trident of Poseidon, the quiver of Artemis and Apollo, with the glittering arrows, suggestive of the dazzling rays of the sun and the moon. Art gradually developed into form the image of the god as it existed in the Grecian imagination, until the form became wrought out to the highest attainable standard of perfection, corresponding in faultless harmony with the divine ideal of the imagination; from their all-pervading atmosphere of fascinating, comprehensive beauty, the Grecian god stepped forth perfect into the realms of immortality.

III.

THE GREEK STATE.

The same advance upon Oriental ideas which marked the religious system of the Greeks is also to be noticed in the respective political systems. The elasticity of the nature of Greece again produces a creative and freedom-inspiring influence. The Greeks are the first people who actually created and applied their artistic genius to perfect the blessing of a distinct nationality and a distinct national economy. In the Orient we find the despotism of an absolute ruler; but in Greece, even during the era of royalty, the will of the people was the law of the land. But even the bare echo of Oriental despotism—limited monarchy—was hateful to the freedom-loving Greek; limited monarchy was abolished, and in its place republics

were substituted, more or less aristocratic or democratic. Herodotus, speaking of the Athenians, used to say: "Freedom was the mother of their majesty and glory." In the Orient there was only one freeman in the State; that freeman was the ruler. But in Greece all Greeks are freemen. To be sure there were the slaves, men who were either forced or who sold themselves into slavery. Alas, slavery is the dark blot of the Greek system! The right of every member of the human family to personal freedom and to citizenship, which begins only now, three thousand years after the Grecian era, to be put into practice, this right was not recognized by the Greeks. But even then the truth was here and there shadowed forth by one or another prophetic thinker, as, for instance, by Aristotle, when he says: "That man possesses by his very nature 'the organization requisite for a member of a body politic, and whosoever does not take his share in the political life of the nation, must be either something less or something more than a man—must be either an animal or a god.'" The assertion, that slavery is indispensable to the existence of republicanism, rests upon a fallacy, which is more than evident from the unquestionable fact that slavery, far from being a blessing, was the curse and the ruin of Greece, and of the whole world of antiquity.

So much for the blot of slavery; but as far as freedom was concerned, wherever it existed among the people of Greece, it may be traced to the remarkable link which wedded every individual to the welfare of the whole State. The State was not a dull mechanism, that alienated the sympathies of the people by its dry conventionality; neither was the Grecian State a colossus like Rome, crushing out individuality, and making it impossible for the citizen to realize a sense of his individual significance in the State. The Greek system may be likened to a relationship of true love, where the lover identifies himself with the tender object of his affection; the citizen identified himself with the State, but the State, in its turn, identified itself with every individual citizen, and the Greek freeman might have exclaimed with greater propriety than the despotic king, Louis XIV., of France: "*L'état, c'est "moi!"*" And how are we to account for this remarkable preponderance of the citizen in the State? The means employed to obtain this preponderance were exceedingly simple. Great attention was paid to the development of the powers of elocution; great exertions were made through gymnastic exercises to develop the physical man to a high standard of personal beauty, and at the same time to give him a thorough training that should fit him for military life.

This relation of the citizen to the State had an important influence upon the development of the Fine Arts in Greece. To constitute man a theme of beauty worthy of the Arts, man must be raised to a more exalted dignity, and this elevating influence could only emanate from the free atmosphere of a republican society. We shall devote a special chapter to the elimination of this particular rela-

tion of republicanism to the Fine Arts. The Greeks may justly be called a *Young Men Nation*, Grecian history beginning with the youth Achilles, and ending with the youth Alexander. If it be true that Art is the blooming spring of culture, the Greek Era may well be called the blooming spring of humanity.

The unfettered movement of the moral and political life of the nation imparts to the Greek character various features, all of which are marked with simplicity and firmness. The figures of the gods and demi-gods, of the heroes, and, at a later period, of the patriots and statesmen, poets, artists, and sages, are all distinguished by a type of mingled simplicity and firmness, such as is indicated by an affinity to the noble class of animals. This is made palpable by the lion-look of Jove, by Homer's comparisons of his heroic figures and characters to animals. It may even be said that the hosts of plastic ideals of gods and heroes, which Grecian Art created as ever-living models for subsequent generations, could never have been called into life if it had not been for this remarkable existence of graceful simplicity and decisive firmness in the general aspect of Greek nature, and if it had not been for the fact that man awoke to a higher sense of his own spiritual power by contrast. Nature and climate, heaven, and earth, and ocean, religion and morality, the State and political life, all contributed to awaken and to strengthen in the mind of Greece a love for the beauty of the material as well as a love for the beauty of the spiritual world. Kritobulus, at one of Xenophon's banquets, was heard to say: "By the 'gods, I would rather be beautiful than be king of Persia!" This is a thorough Greek sentiment. The Grecian poet, in speaking of the four things most desirable as a crown to the happiness of life, places *personal beauty* at the head of his list; the other three desiderata, "Riches, that do not give pain to anybody; health, and "the blessing of friendship," come only in to serve as a setting for the diamond of beauty. The Greek mind thus became a bright mirror, reflecting countless different productions of Art, the beauty of Grecian nature and of Grecian life. These works of Art made the Hellenic breast swell with proud joy and glorious emotion, and they left temples of worship of the Beautiful and monuments of delight to the most distant posterity. This tends to show that what we call the Art of a nation is, in fact, nothing else but the manifestation of the inner life of the people—the inner life as it is produced by the influences of the nature of the country and the character of its society.

CHAPTER II.

DEDALOS.

The person who is endowed by Nature with the gifts of Art, becomes the creator of Art. This induced the Greeks to apply the name of Artist or Dædalos to the first person who possessed the power of lifting Art up, with one single bound of genius, from its crude beginning

to the very height of perfection. Dædalos, that is to say one who has the gift of Art—the Art-genius—is the father of Grecian Art.

All the Greek nationalities have had their special national hero, whose origin is divine, and whose deeds are wonderful. Grecian Art is, in this respect, like the Greek nationalities. Dædalos, the Erechtheus—the scion of the forefather of the Athenians, who was born of earth, and nursed by the daughter of Jove—Dædalos, he is the mythical hero of Attic-Hellenic Art. The same omnipotent influence which Art exerted over the entire world of antiquity, was attributed to Dadalos, the Art-god, who, according to the traditions of the Greeks, travelled over the whole world, in order to leave everywhere monuments of his divine genius. Not only Greece and the Grecian islands, but distant Sicily and Sardinia, even Italy and wondrous Egypt gloried in the possession of his works, and a Greek traveller, Diodoros, the Sicilian, relates, that (at the time of the birth of our Saviour) he still found in Egypt, in one of the islands near Memphis, a temple in honor of Dædalos, which was worshipped by the natives as divinely consecrated ground. Hephaestos, the god, and Prometheus, the demi-god, nay, even Encalion, who knew so well how to transform stones into human beings, are also mentioned in the traditions of the Greeks as fathers of the primitive Arts, and there was not one single member of this venerable family of Art-progenitors who was not traced back to some fabulous Art-grandfather. Still Dædalos is the one who ever was, and ever is, and ever will be at the head of all the Art fathers and Art-grandfathers of antiquity. The specialities of Art may be likened to the rays of the sun; but Dædalos is the sun; he is the artist universal: he is at the same time sculptor and architect, as Phidias was after him, and as Michael Angelo was after Phidias. He builds for Minos in Crete the temple of Britomartis and the Labyrinth, for King Cochilos, of Sicily, he builds his invincible castle on the mount. In Cumæ and Capeca he builds the temples of Apollo, and the most magnificent of the pillared corridors of the miraculous temple of Hephaestos, at Memphis, was wrought by the hand of Dædalos. At the same time, he is the artist who represents the gods and the heroes in wood, metal, and stone, and in all the various towns of Hellas are gods which are the productions of his Art.

Handcraft is the substantial foundation of Art, and mechanics and mechanics are the handmaids. Hence it is that Dædalos is craftsman as well as technicalist, and displays the inventive genius of the creative artist in both. He invented the axe and the saw, the anger and the level. He is jealous of other inventors, and causes the death of Kalos, his nephew, who strove to eclipse him by new inventions; the artist is jealous of his fame. He is mechanic, and invents the mast and the sail-yard, and presses the stormy elements into the service of the children of man. He well-nigh discovered three thousand years ago the uses of steam power; at any rate he had some

thing to do with steam, though only in a medical and sanitary connection, on the occasion of getting up the first vapor bath at Selinunt, in Sicily. The Greek mechanics and artists worshipped the instruments which they daily used, as tokens of remembrance of the great Art father who had invented them. But this worship of Dædalos was not confined to mechanics and artists: the fair maidens of Athens were also bound to him by ties of gratitude. And how could the beautiful Greek girls help feeling grateful to Dædalos when, on the feast of Panathæneon, they felt relieved from a world of trouble by his invention of convenient portable seats, which could be nicely folded together, and comfortably carried under their arms! The god of Hellenic Art is also an engineer and hydraulic architect, knowing how to divert the current of rivers, as, for instance, the river Alabon, which he conducted into the ocean. At the same time, there is every reason to believe that he was a painter too, although there has been no report given of any of his pictures. At any rate, he must have known something about colors, or he could never have succeeded in producing such an excellent imitation of a honey-comb out of gold—such a honey-comb as he presented to the Venus Erycina. The ancients, however, seemed to think, that it would hardly make any difference to Dædalos whether they connected his own name with the honor of the invention of the Art of painting or the name of one of his relatives, and they, therefore, baptized the inventor by the name of *Euchir*, that is to say, "gifted hand."

Dædalos is the mythical conjurer. Imaginative poets were not content to represent him as the inventor of things of practical usefulness, like the sail, etc., they must needs speak of him as a species of providential forerunner of the balloon and artificial flying inventions of our days. In describing his escape from the prison of Crete, the poets scorn to speak of the prosaic sailing vessels in which he effected it. Nothing but artistically elaborated wings will suit their prolific fancy, and they have, perhaps, to answer for the insolent flare-up of his son Ikarus, who came up so close to the sun, that the sun looked upon him as an impudent intruder, and he actually had to pay the penalty of his life for his audacious indiscretion, an incident which has passed into universal proverbs.

Hellenic tradition worships the father of Hellenic Art as a supernatural being. And very justly so, as the transition from the infant state to a riper condition of Art could not well have been effected without the helping hand of some miraculous influence. Is it then worth while to inquire whether any Dædalos at all, or whether this particular Dædalos, contemporary of Minos and Theseus, had actually existed? The Greeks thought he had; and this is all we know about it. They also believed that works of Art were planned and wrought by the gods themselves, for the special benefit of mankind. The crested shields of Hercules and Achilles, the golden and silver statues of youths and dogs in the palace of Alkinos, king of the

Chæaces, are, in Homer's opinion, the works of Hephaestos. While such works of Art are the productions of the genius of man, they were generally attributed to the genius of gods.

If it had not been for the industry of man, the imagination of the poets could never have conceived the idea of the industry of God. Anthropomorphism, the doctrine that the Deity exists in human form is as old as Methuselah. Pausanias,* the ancient traveller, who visited Greece in the second century, and to whom we are indebted for most of our information about Dædalos and his works of Art, did not seem to entertain the least doubt about the fact of the existence of Dædalos, and he speaks of him accordingly as the father of Grecian Art, and the creator of the works of Art that pass by his name, and some of which were still in existence at that time. Pausanias understood that the name of Dædalos was not designed as a general term for works of Art, but was in reality given to the artist who had wrought them. Pausanias' æsthetical appreciation of these works is worth recording. He says of the works of Dædalos: "That they strike him as rather quaint, but that they have unquestionably a certain divine halo."

The later Greeks had evidently the same partiality for the works which belonged to the dawn of Art in antiquity, which the virtuosi of our days have for the works of the dawn of Art at the fifteenth century. Pausanias not only expresses his faith in the statuary of Dædalos, and in the sceptre of the Pelopidæ, which he had seen at Thespis, and which he declares to be the handiwork of Vulcan himself, but he speaks also of many other ancient works of Art which he had seen, and the genuineness of which he does not question; for instance, a Hercules at Thebae, a Trophonius at Lebadea, a Britomartis at Crete, an Athena at Cnossus, an Aphrodite in the shape of Hermes at Delos, a relief of Chortantes of Ariadne in marble, a naked Hercules at Corinth, an image of Diana in a Carian town, and a statue of Minos, which Dædalos executed for the daughters of the king of Crete.

These Dædalosian works of Art may have looked queer enough, and the platonic Socrates records the opinion of the sculptors of the Socratean era, who declared that: "If Dædalos were to rise from his grave, and again produce works of Art similar to those which in his day have won for him so much fame, he would make himself perfectly ridiculous."†

But the progress in plastic Art, of which, according to Greek traditions, Dædalos is considered to be the representative, was not the less prodigious. The transition from the rough image, cut out of stone or wood,—looking like a block of stone or log of wood, without the remotest resemblance to the human form,—to the work of Art which was created more in harmony with Nature and humanity was an immense progress. The transition from the unnatural stiffness of the human form—with the Hermes shape of the

* Pausan. ix. cp. 3.

† Plat. Hipp., msj. p. 410, Bekk.

lower portion of the figure, the legs and feet convulsively tied up together, and hands and arms cleaving to the body—to a free, elastic, natural development of all the members, marks another important progress in the sphere of Art. In the Dædalosian statuary, which, in the historical era, were still looked upon as the works of the old father of Art, we find already a marked improvement. The eyes are no longer shut and dead, but opened and expressive, the legs are no longer fixtures, but appear to be in good walking condition; arms and hands cleave no longer to the body, but display more movement and activity. Socrates here ridiculed the statues of Dædalos by saying that, " Unless tied up they would run away like 'unreliable slaves.'" Philippus, the satarist, the insignificant son of the great Aristophanes, sought to make humorous capital out of Dædalos' wooden statue of Venus, by saying that, " Dædalos probably gave a dose of quicksilver to his Venus in order to produce the constant motion of the statue." But all these railleries are of no avail. The ancient tradition which looked upon the impetus given to Art by Dædalos as a *miracle*, was actually wiser than the wise men of Athens. The tradition saw something wonderful, something supernatural in this progress, and this view was correct. Only Hephaestos himself, the god or a divinity with the same gift of genius, could have leaped with one bound over the gulf which separated the products of a crude elementary era of Art from the higher achievements of a time when artistic culture was a living force.

Such was the reverential spirit of the ancient traditions. But the sophistical rhetoricians and ranting orators, of a later day, looked upon works of Art and Art itself from a purely æsthetical point of view. They assumed belief in the supernatural in order to dazzle the imagination of the people. Kallistratos, for instance, a lecturer on Art of the third century, solemnly asserted, that Dædalos was invested with the power of making his works of Art move about like human beings, but that he only lacked the ability to make them speak and reason. This gift of speech and judgment was, in the opinion of Dr. Kallistratos, only vouchsafed to the works of Art wrought by the Ethiopian artists, and he puts in evidence to support this argument, the case of the Ethiopian statue of Memnon, which is full of soul and feeling, and whose sounds of joy and of sorrow were answered, like those of human beings, by corresponding echoes of cheer or woe. Yet there is at the bottom of such rhetorical extravagances an unmistakable trace of primitive Grecian Art-philosophy, accounted for by the enthusiastic tendency of antiquity to impart soul and life to their works of Art. The development of this tendency may be followed in one unbroken chain from the very dawn of Art to the very climax of its perfection.

The senses presided over the first works of Art. The dawn of Art was controlled by the senses exclusively, but when it reached perfection, spiritual power preponderated.

In the Art era of mere sensual power, the physique was wrought to a miraculous perfection, but in the spiritual Art era even sensuality is made available for moral effects. The gross realities of flesh and blood are ennobled, refined, exalted, and dignified, by the æsthetical development of the work of Art. The superstition of the pious pioneers of Art, and the extravagant hallucinations of flowery rhetoricians, at a later stage of Art development, rest in reality upon original faith in the power of Art to spiritualize matter. The mind of man bows in admiration before its own achievements, and the reverential awe which fills his soul suggests such names as "Holy" and "Divine," to express his sense of admiration for perfect works of Art, although they are nothing but the handiwork of his own genius.

Dædalos stands in the same relation to Art as that in which Homer stands to Poesy; both are representatives of Art eras, which comprise several centuries. According to historical tradition, Dædalos lived as far back as the fifteenth century before Christ. From that time until the sixth century after Christ, his spirit was engrafted upon the world of Art, and we need not wonder that even in the historical era of Art, artists of his school are to be found. This primitive Dædalian school was identical with the same Egypto-Grecian standard of Art, which, for more than a thousand years exerted a powerful influence upon the Art-interests of Hellas, the religious sentiment of the people, with its reverential love for the time-hallowed traditions of the past watching like a guardian angel over the preservation of this influence. This time-hallowed tradition points to Dædalos as the Art-genius who was the first to reform the Egyptian school, by blending foreign ideas with those of the manor born, and thus creating a new school of Art. The name of his parents is as mythic-symbolical as his own. His father's name was Metion, Eupalamos Palamaon, or in other words, "The man of Ideas," "The man endowed with the genius of Art." His mother's name was Phrasimede, or "The ingenious, sagacious, cunning woman." Artists, such as the sculptors Dipoenos and Schyllis, who, according to ancient writers, belong to the historical era of Art, are supposed to have been his pupils, nay, even his own children, the result of the connection which he had at Crete with the daughter of Gortyo. Besides the two we have named, and the Athenean Endoeos, and Learchos of Rhegium, many others are named as having been pupils of his. The Dædalides of Athens, from whom one of the Demes of Attica received its name, looked upon Dædalos, and revered him as the original founder of their family, and we still find Socrates tracing his genealogy back to Dædalos, and swelling with pride at the mention of his name. This tendency of the champions of a new era to revert again and again to the great father of the whole Hellenic world of Art, and to ransack the records of tradition and genealogical tables, with a view to establish a relationship between themselves and Dædalos, is suggestive of two

important historical facts. In the first place, we are enabled to comprehend the belief which prevailed generally concerning the hereditary transmission of artistic genius in certain privileged families, and again it makes more intelligible to us how it came to pass that the artists of the historic era attached such a peculiar importance to a pedigree of a long roll of eminent masters, anxious to make it appear that every one of their illustrious ancestors was the pupil of his predecessor, and that in this wise the genius of Art was more and more developed in the same family in proportion as the ages of time rolled along, actually assuring to the artist a kind of practical guarantee of the gradual realization of his yearnings for perfection. Pantias, the sculptor, who flourished four hundred years before the Christian era, traced his master back to Aristotle of Sicyon, and from Aristotle, seven generations back, he actually traced a complete genealogy of masters, who all belonged to the same family, and who all respectively stood in the position of pupil and master towards each other. We take this fact from Pausanias, who records many similar instances of hereditary transmission of genius.

The ancients, however much they may have raised issues about various incidents in connection with the life of Dædalos, all seem to have agreed upon the fact that there was only one artist who flourished contemporaneously with Dædalos; this was Smilis of Aegina, the son of Euclides. But Pausanias states that he was far inferior to Dædalos. He is the legendary head of the Aeginetan School of Art, while Dædalos is the founder of the School of Attica. As we have frequently spoken of Dædalos in connection with the Egyptian ideas of Art, we are led to investigate the question—How far are we warranted in believing in the Egyptian origin of Grecian Art? If we listen to Winckelmann and his followers, there would seem to be but little foundation for any such belief. They argue that tradition does not seem to know of any other artist, excepting Dædalos, who visited Egypt, and that he even did not go with the view of studying Egyptian works of art, but exclusively for the purpose of completing some nearly finished exquisite work of art. Dædalos, they say, only completed what the Egyptians began. But in refutation of this argument, we beg to adduce the evidence of Theodorus. He states that the son of the architect Rhœcos of Samos was a pupil of Egyptian artists, and this statement of Theodorus is corroborated by Plato, who refers to him and to Ion, as being the most distinguished artists of quite remote antiquity, belonging to the era of Dædalos and Epeios. Winckelmann, and Heinrich Meyer, who, after the death of the former, continued his History of Art, admit that the Greek mechanics used the Egyptian utensils and instruments, because, forsooth, the Egyptians possessed greater aptitude for the artistic manipulation of stony masses, but only as far as purely material creations were concerned. Only hooks, and borers, and axes, and hammers were imported from Egypt. That, in fact, is the whole extent of their admis-

sion. In their opinion, no ideas were imported from Egypt, except hooks, borers, axes, hammers, and the like. But for the origin, development, and characteristics of Grecian Art, they claim pure, unadulterated Hellenic ideas influences and examples in reference to design and to execution, in the fullest sense, without even the slightest restriction or qualification. According to this opinion, which I confess to have entertained myself during many long years, it would seem as if the genius of Art—the seeds of Art—is the same in every land; as if the first experiments of Art did spring with all nations from one and the same source. But while the seeds of different plants bear the greatest imaginable resemblance to each other, do not the plants, as soon as they have sprouted into blossom, present the greatest possible variety? Even the most opposite things look very much alike on their first appearance upon the stage of life; but the resemblance grows fainter in proportion as the development increases in years and strength. Such is the nature of things, and such is the law of Nature.

The mechanical ingenuity of one nation may render valuable assistance to the æsthetical genius of another nation, may be adopted and made available, as in the case of the coloring which the Italian artists adopted from the Flemish School. But would this warrant the assertion that the genius of Italian Art has been produced by Flemish influence. Certainly not. The simple fact was, that the Flemish ingenuity in hitting upon the use of oil colors, became of material assistance to the execution of works inspired by Italian genius. The distinction between ingenuity and genius, between mechanical manipulation of colors and spiritual conception of ideas, should be constantly kept in view. It would be preposterous to base the general foundation of Art in one country upon the inspiration and ideas derived from another country. This must be evident to all philosophical minds who are loth to draw general conclusions from isolated, incidental, or accidental facts. Have not the discoveries of Layard in Nineveh established the Assyrian origin of many Grecian works of sculpture and architecture, which were previously all put down to Grecian conception? Layard adduces many evidences of this fact, as, for instance, the honey-suckle, which the Grecians used as an ornament in some of their works of art, and which the English traveller found in the greatest perfection upon the very oldest monuments of Nineveh; he also mentions in the same connection, the interwoven bands with which the Grecians used to embellish their works of art, and which they considered as an invention of their own, while in fact, they were in vogue in Nineveh from time immemorial.

Alexander von Humboldt found near the cataracts of the Orinoco funeral urns with handles fashioned by an extinct race of indigenous Americans. The upper edges of these urns were adorned with the same intricate commingling of lines and other figures which we find in the architectural and statuary works of the Grecians and

Romans, as for instance in the Temple of Deus Rediculus at Rome. They are to be found in all countries, on the walls of Mexican palaces, on the shields of the Otaheitans, in all places where the harmonious reproduction of regular forms flatters the eye and charms the senses. Humboldt says that "the cause of this resemblance proceeds rather from psychological considerations, from the inner nature of our mental organization, than from any similarity of origin, or association between the respective nationalities."^{*}

There are certainly many elements of Art, imported originally from abroad, that strike root in the native soil, and in this respect the Greek nation does not differ from other nations. Many elements of Grecian Art can easily be traced to Assyrian, Persian, and Egyptian origin. This foreign influence, however, does not consist in one or the other speciality of foreign symbolical Art, such as the Trident, and the mythological figures of the Griffin and the Pegasus of the Abyssinians, or such stray specimens of ornamental Art as are spoken of by Layard and Humboldt, but rather to the technical instruction and technical instruments which were imported from foreign nations, and turned to available account. A striking instance of the correctness of this proposition may be found in the very fact that the Father of Grecian Fine Arts, whose exploits in Egypt are glorified by the ancients, and to whom exclusive homage is paid, becomes also the hallowed object of veneration for his invention of mechanical instruments. But we find another still more cogent argument in the saw in the hands of Dædalos, as represented in ancient Grecian works of Art, which is the identical saw of the obelisks of Egypt, as for instance, the obelisk at Rome, which Augustus consecrated to the Sun. Winckelmann himself was struck with this coincidence, and came to the conclusion that the saw was invented by Egyptians, or at any rate previous to the Grecian era.[†] The connection between tradition and positive evidence, between myth and history, is too palpable in this case, and it is well nigh impossible to shut one's eyes to such glaring facts. In the opinion of Winckelmann and his followers, Grecian Art is, from first to last, purely and exclusively Grecian; Grecian from the most rudimentary elements up to the loftiest climax of perfection. Their faith is fixed in *total originality*: foreign influences they entirely deny. How far this opinion is compatible with the result of the researches and investigation of modern times, shall be discussed by us in a separate chapter.

Smilis, son of Euclides of Ægina, a sculptor of the legendary period, the mythical contemporary of Dædalos, cannot be compared to him in point of glory; but there is the same symbolical aroma about his name. The name of Smilis is derived from the Greek word Smile (σμίλη), the Greek term for an implement shaped somewhat like a knife, and used by sculptors and carvers in wood. Such

symbolical names abound in the legendary era. The Grecian artists felt anxious to perpetuate themselves in familiar names of such auspicious augury. The spirit in which these names originated also animates Homer, whose seafaring Phœaceans all bear names singularly suggestive of their sailor's life and sailor's genius (*Odyssey*, vii. 112). According to tradition, Smilis was a native of Ægina; in the opinion of the writers on Art, he was the legendary head of the Æginetan School of Sculpture. In the historical era, especially in the later period, his works were believed to be still in existence; but there was as much or as little ground for such a belief in his case as in the case of Dædalos. All these personages of the mythical era up to about 500 years before the Christian dispensation, whose life and works were, even in the times of antiquity, involved in doubts and mystery, afford no other interest to us except that which always hovers around names that are vague or unauthenticated. To give an idea of the confusion which existed in relation to names, we may point to the fact that Dipenios and Skyllis, celebrated sculptors of the 6th century before Christ, are represented as pupils, and, by some accounts, even as sons of Dædalos; while Smilis, who was the contemporary of Dædalos, is reported by other chroniclers, to have lived two to three hundred years after the era of Dædalos at the beginning of the historical era. The Attic sculptor, Endoios, who flourished in the middle of the 6th century before Christ, was in the same blundering manner reported to have been a pupil of Dædalos. Although these artists may well presume upon a historical reputation, yet the gulf between their remote era and the advanced Art-period of Phidias, is not the less immense. But the fact was this. Tradition takes up indiscriminately all such names, and forthwith connects them with the glory and the genius of Dædalos, the illustrious Father of Grecian Art. But it must be admitted that there were ample reasons to warrant the connection. The influence of the Egypto-Grecian Art School founded by Dædalos, was felt for thousands of years and more; and even at a later period, when Art in Hellas was progressing towards perfection with gigantic strides, the spirit of the olden times of old Dædalos, still protrudes beneath; these altered and perfected artistic creations of more advanced periods, still continue to sway the Hellenic mind in various religious ideas and systems connected with the celebration of the worship of their divinities.

As a general result of all the investigations of modern scholars, it may be stated, that historical elements for the legitimate foundation of Grecian Art hardly present themselves until the beginning of the 6th century before Christ. At that time the political life of Hellas assumes a more definite shape; the seven wise men of Greece—men not only celebrated for their wisdom, but also respected for their statesmanlike qualities—come forward to enlighten public opinion; philosophers and historians begin to assert their influence; poesy does not lose its spell, but philosophy

* Alexander von Humboldt: *Views of Nature*, i. 226-227 (2d Edit.)

† Winckelmann Monum. ined. zu. No. 94.

infuses more thought into poetical minds; history sows the time-honored seeds of experience; commerce begins to flourish; industry prospers in many portions of Greece, especially upon the islands; and many of the population become affluent and rich. This admirable progress in the life of the people re-acted favorably upon the Fine Arts. In times past Art had to pander to the pedantry of creeds and the bigotry of priests, and occasionally had to perform the menial services of a mechanic. But with the beginning of the 6th century before Christ, Art began to assert her independence, and to exercise her creative power; she began to produce works which were instinct with this independence, this creative power; instinct with originality and genius; they were *works of Art* in the highest sense of the word. But let it not be imagined that this transition was brought about spasmodically. Like all things and thoughts of spiritual grandeur and majesty, the transition took place quietly, silently, unobtrusively, modestly, slowly. Nor could there yet have been any question of schools like those of the subsequent Venetian and Florentine schools, fixed laws and styles of Art. We are not aware that any distinct rules, or school existed, where every artist established a theory of Art according to his own particular genius, and where the statues of the divinities or other works of Art are susceptible of classification. Such distinct schools did not exist. All that we know is, that Art flourished first in the islands, where wealth, produced by commercial activity, afforded the possibility of gratifying the sense of the Beautiful, by a liberal patronage of Art and artists. The nearest towns and villages on the continent soon imitated the example of the islands. The artists of Samos and Chios received extensive commissions from the towns on the coast of Asia Minor; Cretan artists establish themselves in Morea and in Italy. The artists of Egina are the first to display the greatest activity. The progress of the continent is not near so rapid, and Athens, which was destined to become eventually the great focus of Grecian Art, displayed at the dawn of Art the most singular apathy, presenting not one single artistic reputation, excepting the name of Dædalos. Hence the partiality of the Athenians for old Dædalos, and their anxiety to honor his memory.

But, after the downfall of the Pisistratide dynasty, Art began to flourish in Athens, and we hear of Antenor, who executed the statues of the tyrants Harmodios and Aristogeiton; and of Amphikrates, who executed the statue of a colossal lion, which was erected before the gates of the town in honor of Leaina, the heroic woman, who clung with unfaltering affection to her lover Aristogeiton.

This is the time, when Athens begins to merit the good opinion of Plutarch, who characterizes the noble city as—"The devoted mother and affectionate nurse of many "various spheres of Art, invention, and creative genius, producing noble fruits, in every direction, and watching with "untiring vigilance over their growth and conservation."

EXTRACTS
FROM THE
DIARY OF AN ARTIST.

By Jack Tupper.

TUESDAY, May 25, 1841.

BEGGED another sitting of Dr. S—, in order to put the last finish to his medallion. Impossible to do this in absence of the sitter, without compromising the spirit of the likeness; resolve never to attempt it in future. The ground must have much to do with the effect of a relieve; for after one has got it flat, and set right the inequalities, so sure to arise in the process of modelling, the face itself seems to want something. The cause of this cannot be from the inequalities and portions of clay that may stick to the ground, casting reflections on the relief; since then, in a high relief (which would receive more reflections), this fact would be more observable; whereas it is exactly the contrary: a high relief is much more independent of the ground than a low relief is. No, the cause of this mysterious relation between the ground and the basso upon it must lie somewhere else? What is the essential difference between a *high* and a *low* relief, considering them in *extremis*?—If I take an extremely high relief of a face, it will be the veritable half of a face, the section passing vertically through the centre of the forehead and nose, and laid upon a flat ground. Now a low relief of the same—what is it? Certainly not a proportional reduction in the various depths of the half-face: such an uniform flattening would not do it, because whilst the *markings* on any *surface*, such as the modelling in the ear, the eyelids, and wrinkles of the skin, are shown in their natural relief; the respective surfaces on which these stand, are not relieved from one another in the same proportion. The face here is, in fact, divided into planes which, when parallel, and abruptly terminating one on the other, with sides at right angles, may be comparatively on the same level, because in that case the depth of the sides is not appreciated. But then the markings, on a more distant plane, are less pronounced than those on a more advanced plane, in order that the distant plane may appear to retire, as in painting, from its want of distinctness, as well as from its perspective diminution. The striking difference, then, between high and low relief appears to be here: the one is a *veritable reproduction of form*, however it be attached to a ground: the other is a half pictorial equivalent for this form. In the medallion before me the plane of the cheek bone is raised from that of the nose not more than three-quarters of an inch, whereas, in Nature, the distance between these two planes must be two inches and a half. In the cast, now, tracing forwards from the plane of the cheek bone to that of the outer canthus of the eye, there is a gradual sinking of a quarter of an inch, which corresponds to nearly an inch, in Nature; and then forward again from the plane of the outer to that of the inner canthus (which is invisible, being hidden behind the contour of